

Shutter Louver Brake, SN 10/648,116  
page 6

**Remarks:**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's prior art search and careful examination of this application.

In order to resolve the Section 112 issues concerning clarity of the claims, claims 1 - 10 have been amended to remove the word "louver" from the preamble. Claim 6 has been amended to clarify that each louver is pivotably mounted for rotation about its respective axis of rotation. Claim 6 has also been amended to recite a means for generating resistance, thus eliminating the need for any antecedent basis for "the resistance". Claim 7 has been amended to state "said respective axis of rotation". Claim 8 has been amended to clarify that what is being stopped is "said one end from rotation with said mounting pin."

Claims 1 -3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Busse et al. In Busse, the brake element 56 is a static support member, which must be pierced by the pivot pins to provide an interference fit between the brake element and the pivot pins. It is this interference fit which provides the resistance to rotation of the louvers.

Claim 1 has been amended to add the limitation that the "band brake element has first and second ends and at least one of said first and second ends of said band brake element rotates with said mounting pin". This distinguishes the claimed invention from Busse, where the entire band brake element 56 is stationary. Since a brake element having an end that rotates with the mounting pin is not taught or suggested by Busse, this claim recites an invention that is both novel and unobvious in view of the prior art.

Claim 2 adds the limitation that the receptacle on the shutter frame defines a stop for stopping the rotation of at least one of the band brake element ends so as to increase frictional resistance to rotation of the mounting pin as the mounting pin begins to rotate. This combination also is not taught or suggested.

Claim 3 adds the limitation of a second stop, for stopping the rotation of the other of the brake element ends. Again, this combination is not taught or suggested.

Claim 4 had already been considered to include patentable subject matter.

Claim 5 adds the feature that the second stop limits the increase of frictional resistance between the band brake and the mounting pin. Again, this combination has not been taught or suggested.

Claims 6 - 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wagenen. Wagenen teaches the use of a hand-rotated set screw C to

Shutter Louver Brake, SN 10/648,116  
page 7

manually increase the resistance to rotation. The rotation of the louvers about their axes of rotation has no effect on the amount of resistance created by the set screw.

Claim 6 has been amended to add the limitation that the means for generating progressively increasing resistance is in response to the rotation of the louvers. In Wagenen, the resistance can be increased by manually tightening the set screw, but the increased resistance would then be caused by rotating the set screw; it would not be caused by or responsive to the rotation of the louvers. In the invention as recited in claim 6, it is the rotation of the louvers that creates the increase in resistance. This combination is not taught or suggested in the prior art.

Claim 7 adds the limitation that the means for increasing resistance includes a band brake.

Claim 8 adds the limitation of a stop which stops one end of the band brake as it begins to rotate with its respective mounting pin, causing an increase in the inwardly-directed braking force. The band brake H of Wagenen does not rotate with its respective mounting pin, and there is no stopping of the band brake H that would cause an increase in resistance as claimed.

Claim 9 adds the limitation of means for limiting the progressive increase in resistance to a set maximum. Again, the prior art does not teach this combination.

Claim 10 depends from claim 8 and adds the limitation of means for limiting the progressive increase in resistance, including the receptacle having a second stop which stops the rotation of the second end of the band brake. This combination is not taught or suggested by the art.

Since all the claims recite an invention that is both novel and unobvious in view of the prior art, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all the claims now pending in the present application. If there are any remaining problems with

Shutter Louver Brake, SN 10/648,116  
page 8

this application, Applicant's attorney would appreciate a call from the Examiner to help expedite their resolution.

Respectfully submitted,



Theresa Fritz Camoriano  
Reg. No. 30,038  
Camoriano and Associates  
8225 Shelbyville Road  
Louisville KY 40222  
phone 502-423-9850  
fax 502-426-1167